



Kathryn
Hernandez/EPR/R8/USEPA/
US

04/06/2006 03:31 PM

To Michael Haire/DC/USEPA/US

cc

bcc

Subject Watershed Project proposal

This is just a general description of the project I had envisioned proposing. Let me know what areas need flushing out, etc. that would make it fit into your vision of a strong Watershed Project proposal.

Silver Creek Watershed, Park City, Utah

The site is a joint water and waste watershed. The areas has been impacted by historic mining. The TMDL was developed for cadmium and zinc. Metals of concern include zinc, lead, arsenic and cadmium. The TMDL had broad allocations to areas in the watershed.

The two significant point sources include the Prospector Square which drains the Judge Tunnel and the Waste Water Treatment Plant at the lower end of the watershed.

The Lower Silver Creek is currently undergoing significant development. There are few if any resources available to assess and implement cleanup in the Lower Silver Creek. Assessment and quantification of the existing load is critical data needed to negotiate with the developer, in hope that remediation could be conducted during development. Water quality and sediment data has been collected but an assessment is needed to determine the nature and extent of mine waste and its potential loading. This data would allow us to map the existing waste piles and conduct an alternatives analysis to determine the expected load reductions from remediation of the waste and the corresponding costs that correlate to various cleanup alternative. This would allow us to prioritize the cleanup of the various sites, thus allowing us to get the "biggest bang for our buck".

Simultaneously, we would assess alternative for treating discharge in the Upper Silver Creek basin from the Judge Tunnel. The City is very concerned that this discharge has been classified as a point source and due to economic constraints believes that it is not economically feasible to them to meet the existing TMDL. Several alternatives, including lining the pipe that collects the discharge have been proposed which would reduce the load of metals to be treated, but the city does not have adequate funds to complete an alternatives analysis for passive treatment of their discharge.

We would be working with the state monitoring program to collect any additional water quality data, the state permits group in regards to the effluent limits in the 2 UPDES permits. Currently the WWTP must treat below water quality standards due to the background concentrations in the stream. Currently water quality standards are not being met and cannot be met without this more comprehensive analysis.

Kathryn Hernandez
USEPA, Region VIII (8EPR-SR)
999 18th Street, Ste 300
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 312-6101 (office)
(720) 951-0974 (cell)

1) energy efficiency

Energy Star Label for building

(tools, including design tools

most energy efficient, cost effective tools)